

Patent application 09/892,351 filed 06/28/01
 New Zealand priority app' 505513 June 30 2000.
 Mark Thomas Dawson
 555 Rewi Street
 Te Awamutu New Zealand.
 Ph/fax 0064 7 871 8403.
 29 November 05.



To the Commissioner of Patents and
 examiner, Ahmed Samir Anwar,

Please accept this RCE 1.114 submission for a request for continued examination of
 my patent application 09/892,351 for amendments as detailed below.
 Enclosed is an RCE transmittal and fee of \$395 as set forth in 1.17(e)

The notice of allowability does not confirm receipt of a certified copy of priority document NZ 505513.
 This was sent to your office with the application in June 2001.

The amendments do not disclose new matter beyond the original disclosure or raise question of
 patentability.

Concerning amendments to the specification.

On page 12, please ensure that the filter values are transcribed by your office as two separate lists or as two
 separate paragraphs and that they are not mixed.

One list of values is for the image viewed through red gel.

Another list for the image viewed through green/blue gel.

On page 13 after '6. That the anaglyphically viewed ... opposing color wash.'

delete (An example of ACB...where luminosity compression is not used is as follows:)

also delete the two vertical lists of filter values;

(For the image viewed through red gel...Black +or- black optional.) and

(For the image viewed through green/blue gel... Black +or-black optional.)

Concerning amendments to the claims.

The detailed action of 19 October 2004 page 5 item 5, rejected claims 1-19 for failing to distinctly claim the
 invention.

I request the following amendments in order to distinctly claim the invention.

Claim 1. after 'in whole or in part,' insert, where the processes effected to said images may be applied in a single
 sweep.

Please see lines 22-23 on page 14 of the specification as originally mailed.

'...values for the ACB Contrast Expansion Filter may follow those of the preceding treatments and be pre-
 set to render all adjustments with a single sweep.'

Claim 1c. and 1d.

I request that steps 1c and 1d of claim 1 are removed and replaced as dependant claims.

The detaled action of 19 October 2004 stated on page 6 line 17; '...as claimed steps b, c and e-h are optional and are
 thereby not required...'

Please refer to my reply of January 2005 to the above action. See page 5 lines 8-9 of my reply as follows,

'Concerning steps b, c and e-h being optional.

Claim 1 is now rewritten to avoid optional steps.'

However, the rewritten steps 1c and 1d remained optional.

I consider that steps d-h as originally filed to be optional steps rather than steps b, c and e-h as pointed out by the
 examiner.

Original claim 1 steps b and c were combined as step b. effecting selective color...

Original claim 1 steps g, h and i were combined as step ((e)) c. effecting a first anaglyphic color...

However, the amendment of January 2005 retained optional steps 1c. effecting selective control for increasing the
 overall brightness ...

and 1d. effecting a compression...

Concerning the current claim 1c.